

**REMARKS**

This case has been carefully reviewed and analyzed in view of the Official Action dated 15 December 2005. Responsive to the objections and rejections made in the Official Action, Claims 1, 2 and 4-6 have been amended to clarify the language thereof.

In the Official Action, the Examiner objected to the Specification because the Title was not clearly indicative of the subject matter to which the Claims were directed. The Examiner required a new Title which included at least one technical or inventive feature of the claimed invention. Further, the Examiner noted that the disclosure contained a number of informalities and further did not provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed first, second, and third covering bodies.

The Specification has been amended to correct those informalities kindly noted by the Examiner as well as several others found therein. Additionally, the Title has been amended so that it is now clearly indicative of the invention to which the Claims are directed. If the Examiner still believes the Title is unacceptable, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone the undersigned Attorney so that agreement may be reached on an appropriate Title. The Specification has been further amended to identify each of the covering bodies 121, 131 and 141 as to being first, second, and third covering bodies, as claimed. Thus, it is now believed that the Specification has been corrected to

MR957-1465

Serial Number: 10/790,103

Reply to Office Action dated 15 December 2005

overcome the objections raised by the Examiner and provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter.

In the Official Action, the Examiner objected to Claims 1 and 4 due to informalities therein and rejected Claims 1-6 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, because the structure of the dustbin was not clearly set forth in the Claims.

Claims 1-6 have been amended to correct the informalities therein and clarify the structure and relationship of the claimed elements defined thereby. It is believed that the Claims now clearly set forth the structure of the invention of the subject Patent Application, such that the Claims now particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that Applicant regards as the invention.

For all of the foregoing reasons, it is now believed that the subject Patent Application has been placed in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,  
For: ROSENBERG, KLEIN & LEE



David I. Klein  
Registration #33,253

Dated: *2 March 2006*

Suite 101  
3458 Ellicott Center Drive  
Ellicott City, MD 21043  
(410) 465-6678  
Customer No. 04586